UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,509	08/01/2003	Letian Chen	1033-SS00416	4334

84326   7590   11/02/2009
AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - Toler
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING
ROOM 2A-207
ONE AT & T WAY
BEDMINISTER, NJ 07921

EXAMINER
CUMARASEGARAN, VERN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/632,509	CHEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	VERN CUMARASEGARAN	3629

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 July 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10-14, 21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10-14, 21 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-6, 10-14, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Florance et al. (US 2002/0065739 A1).

As to claim 1, Florance et al show a persistence layer (Fig.1, A16) that stores a

plurality of properties in a computer-readable storage medium (paragraph 425

"*...memory means for storing data...*");

an application layer that offers services to applications programs having a

variable dependent on one of the plurality of properties (paragraph 263 *where an*

application program that forwards information to researchers whose research criteria

relate to that information would have variables that depend upon the research criteria of

properties), the services being offered through an application programming interface

provided by the application layer, the services including substantially immediately

notifying an application program having a variable dependent on a particular property

when a notification of an update for the particular property is received wherein the

services further include receiving from the application program a list of property names

of properties upon which one or more variables of the application program depends

(paragraph 263 *where trackers of certain information would be immediately notified when an update to the tracked information occurs*); and

a interface layer that accepts user input to update properties stored by the persistence layer (Fig.73), wherein the interface layer notifies the application layer of the update for the particular property (paragraph 54).

As to claims 4 and 5, Florance et al show application class of a middleware application (Fig.1 *where database application is considered middleware*).

As to claim 6, Florance et al show application layer being contained within a common project within middleware (Fig.1).

As to claims 10, 11, 14, Florance et al show displaying of property information (paragraph 148 *where the type of information is considered non-functional descriptive language and thus is not given patentable weight*).

As to claims 12, 13, Florance et al show accepting user input to update property information (Fig.1).

As to claims 21 and 22, Florance et al show accepting, into an interface layer of a property-manager system, user input to update a first property stored in a computer-readable storage medium, the first property including a name- value pair (Fig.1); in response to accepting the user input, notifying an application layer of the system of the updated first property, the application layer offering services to applications that have a variable dependent on the first property, the services being offered through an application programming interface provided by the application layer, the services including substantially immediately notifying an application having a variable dependent

on the updated first property when an update for the first property is received wherein

the services further include registering the applications and receiving from each of the

applications a list of property names upon which one or more variables of the

application depends (paragraph 263 where when a researcher selects to use the

application to be notified of updates, it is considered to be registering of application);

and in response to the application layer being notified of the updated first property,

notifying an application having a variable dependent on the first property of the updated

first property, wherein the notifying the application is performed by the application layer

(paragraph 54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Florance et al. (US 2002/0065739 A1) in view of Mukundan et al (US 6,907,451

B1).

As to claim 2, Mukundal et al show an application class including a property

listener that receives the notification, the property listener including a list of property

keys of interest to the application second property listener that can modify variables in

the second software application without having to restart the second software
application program (col.42-43 lines 60-9 where "marked fields" are considered to be
keys of interest). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify
Florance et al and incorporate the method of Mukundal et al since the claimed invention
is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element
merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of
ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination
were predictable. (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] "*The combination of familiar elements
according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield
predictable results.*").

   As to claim 3, Mukundal et al show an application layer that maintains a lookup
table that records, for each of a plurality of property keys, a list of property listeners that
have registered with the application layer to listen for that property key (col.41 lines 13-
26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify
Florance et al and incorporate the method of Mukundal et al since the claimed invention
is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element
merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of
ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination
were predictable. (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] "*The combination of familiar elements
according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield
predictable results.*").

As to claim 7, Mukundal et al show application layer being contained in a client JAVA file (col.4, lines 52-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Florance et al and incorporate the method of Mukundal et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] "*The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.*").

As to claim 8, Mukundal et al show dynamic link library (Fig.13 *where runtime library is considered dynamic link library*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Florance et al and incorporate the method of Mukundal et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] "*The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.*").

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 22, 2009 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's assertions regarding claim 1, Florance shows

services offered by an application layer including receiving from an application program

a list of names of properties upon which one or more variables of the

application program depends in paragraph 263 where an application program that

forwards property information to researchers whose research criteria relate to that

property information would have variables that depend upon the research criteria of

properties.

As to the applicant's arguments regarding claims 21 and 22, Florance shows

registering of application in paragraph 263 where when a researcher selects to use the

application to be notified of updates, it is considered to be registering of the application.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

Vinati et al. US 2002/0046213 A1 - Has the feature of promptly modifying

property data

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

　　　Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to VERN CUMARASEGARAN whose telephone number is

(571)270-3273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30am-

5:00pm.

　　　If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

　　　Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vern Cumarasegaran/
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629